fested in the life of a complex multicellular organism-
that unity on which all these authors insist; on which'
indeed, as it seems to me, they insist too much, neglecting
the evidences of lack of complete unity and harmony
between the parts ?

To this question the authors of this group return no
answer. To say that each organism is merely a part of a
larger whole, and that all things are ultimately parts of
one whole may be true ; but so long as the parts are (or
appear to be) distinct and relatively independent systems
of activity, we must seek an explanation of unities in
terms of reciprocal influences. There is no other possi-
bility ; or if there is any other possibility of such explanation
or meaning of unity, why has it not been indicated or at
least hinted at by any one of the exponents of Holism ?
These authors throw no light on this problem, neither
as it is presented by the parts of one complex or-
ganism, nor by the many organisms which, according
to their doctrine, are components of an all-embracing
whole.

Another weakness of this form of the holistic doctrine
is that its exponents are unable to point to any evidence
that in the realm of the non-living occur activities of the
teleologic type. They insist much on the internal
activities and energies of the atoms, and they welcome the
modern grounds for rejecting the metaphysical deter-
minism which was a feature of nineteenth-century physics.
But this latter improvement of physical doctrine is the
mere rejection of the hampering influence on our thought

of an old error: its effect is merely permissive ; it merely removes a bar to belief in teleological activity in the inorganic sphere.

If these authors could point to one scrap of evidence